UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

United States of	f America,)	Case No.	CR	18-004	to 157	
	Plaintiff,)	STIPULAT	ΓED OR DER TH	DER EXC IE SPEED	LUDING Y TRIAL A	ACTEB 12 2018
WALLACE L	-EE GILMORE Defendant.)				N	SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT ORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND
For the reason stated by the parties on the record on Feb. 12, 2018, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from Feb. 12, 2018, to Feb. 23, 2018, and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factors:							
	Failure to grant a continua See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7		ld be likely	to result	in a misca	rriage of ju	ustice.
	The case is so unusual or defendants, the nature of to or law, that it is unreasonal itself within the time limit	he prosectible to ex	cution, or the pect adequa	e exister te prepa	nce of nove ration for p	el question pretrial pro	s of fact ceedings or the trial
	Failure to grant a continua taking into account the ex		475				
	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, giver counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).						
	For the reasons stated on the 3161(b) and waived with the 5.1(c) and (d).						
	For the reasons stated on the 3161(h)(1)(E)(F) for delay						
IT IS SO ORD	ERED.		1	1	- 1	1 1	
DATED: 3/12	3 /18			The second secon	Westmore es Magistra		ndl
STIPULATED:	Attorney for Defendant Loyce LEAVITT		Ass B		nited State	s Attorney	<u> </u>